UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,730	09/30/2004	Ricky Gene Braddy	2006579-0250 (CTX-118)	5729

69665   7590   04/28/2009

CHOATE, HALL & STEWART / CITRIX SYSTEMS, INC.
TWO INTERNATIONAL PLACE
BOSTON, MA 02110

EXAMINER
WINDER, PATRICE L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2445	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/28/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/711,730	BRADDY ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Patrice Winder	2445	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 February 2009*.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-21 and 23-56* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-21 and 23-56* is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date *2-11-2009*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-21, 23-56 are pending.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on

February 11, 2009 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

3.   Applicant's arguments filed February 11, 2009 have been fully considered but

they are not persuasive.

A. Applicant argues – "The access control server determines a level of access for the

file and determines a second file type."

4.   In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain

features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies

(i.e., an access control server determines both a level of access and a second type of

file) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light

of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See

In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

B. Applicant argues – "Pfitzner fails to disclose determining, responsive to a level of access determined in an access control decision, a second file type for presentation to the client."

Although, applicant admits that Pfitzner taught "business object types", see page 11, paragraph 1 of the remarks filed February 11, 2009, it is clear from applicant's remarks that applicant has confused the terminology "business object types" with file types. (Possibly because each is associated with the label type.) The type of Pfitzner's "business object type" identifies what kind of content is packed into a "business object". Those "business objects" are stored and accessed by a particular reference address [paragraph 34]. The business object data at the reference address is associated with a particular that can access the "business object", i.e. the first file type [paragraph 38]. Upon an access control decision, implemented using the rules of Pfitzner's redirection decision mechanism the requested reference address is transformed to a translated reference address [paragraph 37]. As determined by the conditions of the access redirection decision rules, the translated reference address indicates equivalent "business object" data stored at an alternate location and accessible by a different application program, i.e. a second file type. Pfitzner supports this interpretation of the redirection service 310 in paragraphs 44-45.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6.   Claims 1-13, 20-21, 23-38, 45-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Pfitzner, US 2004/0215826 A1 (hereafter referred to Pfitzner).

[claim 1] Pfitzner taught a method for providing file contents comprising the steps of:

transmitting, by a client node, a request for a file having a native file type (accessing

remote business object, pgraph 30, lines 1-7, XML file type, pgraph 27, lines 17-20);

receiving, by an access control server (redirection process 200, pgraph 36, lines 3-7),

the request for the file (receiving request for business object, paragraph 34);

making, by an access control server, an access control decision to determine the level

of access for the file (using redirection decision rules, pgraph 39);

determining, responsive to the access control decision, a second file type (determining

computing environment information, type of object, pgraph 38, lines 1-3);

determining an identifier for an application program associated with the second file type

(determining computing environment type of software, pgraph 38); and

presenting the contents of the file to the client node using the application program

(displaying business object, pgraph 52).

[claim 2] Pfitzner taught the method of step (f) further comprises presenting, by an application server in application server farm (web server services 320, pgraph 43), the contents of the file to the client node (displaying business object, pgraph 52).

[claim 3] Rfitzner taught the method of comprising determining, by a first application server in the application server farm (redirection service 310), an application associated with the second file type (determining computing environment information software type, pgraph 38).

[claim 4] Pfitzner taught the method of comprising presenting, by the first application server in the application server farm (in one embodiment web services includes redirection services, pgraph 43, lines 8-13), the contents of the file to the client node (displaying business object, pgraph 52).

[claim 5] Pfitzner taught the method of further comprising presenting, by a second application server in the application server farm (web server services), the content of the file to the client node (displaying by web server process, pgraph 45).

[claim 6] Pfitzner taught the method wherein step (d) further comprises, determining, by an access control server (redirection service), a second file type for the file, responsive to level of access (determining computing environment type of object, pgraph 38).

[claim 7] Pfitzner taught the method wherein step (d) further comprises, determining, by an application server in an application server farm (in one embodiment web server service includes redirection service), a second file type for the file (invoking redirection service, paragraph 50).

[claim 8] Pfitzner taught the method wherein step (e) further comprises determining, by an access control server (redirection service), an identifier for an application program associated with the second file type (determining computing environment information type of software, pgraph 38).

[claim 9] Pfitzner taught the method of claim 1 wherein step (e) further comprises determining, by an application server in the application server farm (in one embodiment web server service includes redirection service), an identifier for an application program associated with the second file type (determining computing environment information type of software, pgraph 38).

[claim 10] Pfitzner taught the method of claim 1 wherein a step of acquiring, by the access control server (redirection service), information about the client node (obtaining computing environment, pgraph 38).

[claim 11] Pftizner taught the method of claim 10 wherein step (c) further comprises comparing the information acquired by the access control server to a policy to make the access control decision (comparing to redirection decision rules, pgraph 51).

[claim 12] Pfitzner taught the method of claim 10 wherein step(f) further comprises using, by an application server (in one embodiment the web server service includes the redirection service, pgraph 43, lines 8-13), acquired information to select a format for the presentation of the file contents (pgraph 39).

[claim 13] Pfitzner taught the method of claim 10 wherein step (f) further comprises presenting the contents of the file by applying a policy to the acquired information to

select a format for presentation of the file contents (using redirection decision rules,

pgraphs 51-52).

[claim 20] Pfitzner taught the method of claim 1 further comprising the step of retrieving

the file from a file server (URL retrieved from file service, pgraph 52).

[claim 21] Pfitzner taught the method of claim 20 further comprising the step of

retrieving, by an application server (web server service), the file from a file server

(pgraph 52).

[claim 23] Pfitzner taught the method of claim 1 further comprising the step of retrieving

the file from a web server (pgraph 52).

[claim 24] Pfitzner taught the method of claim 23 further comprising the step of

retrieving, by an application server (web server service), the file from a web server

(pgraph 52).

[claim 25] Pfitzner taught the method of claim 23 further comprising the step of

retrieving, by an access control server (in one embodiment web server includes

redirection service), the file from a web server (pgraph 52).

[claim 26] Pfitzner taught the method of claim 1 further comprising the step of retrieving

the file from an email server (groupware server is a Microsoft Exchange server, pgraph

48-49).

[claim 27] Pfitzner taught the method of claim 26 further comprising the step of

retrieving, by an application server (web server service), the file from an email server

(pgraph 52).

[claim 28] Pfitzner taught further comprising the step of retrieving, by an access control server (in one embodiment web server service includes redirection service), the file from an email server (groupware server is a Microsoft Exchange server, pgraph 48-49).

 [claim 29] Pfitzner taught the method of claim 1 further comprising the step of connecting, by a client node, to an application server (web server sending desired file, pgraph 52).

[claim 30] Pfitzner taught the method of claim 29 wherein step (f) further comprises presenting the contents of the file to the client node over the connection (pgraph 52).

[claim 31] Pfitzner taught the method of claim 1 further comprising the step of transmitting, by an access control server (redirection server), an executable file to the client node (reference address points to method, pgraph 62).

[claim 32] Pfitzner taught the method of claim 31 further comprising identifying, by the executable file, the application server opening the file for the client node (method invoked at client node, pgraph 62).

[claim 33] Pfitzner taught the method of claim 1 wherein step (a) comprising the client node residing on a first network separated from a second network by a network boundary (first and second network separated by gateway 170, pgraph 32), the client node requesting a file from an access control server, residing on the second network (pgraph 36, lines 1-9)

[claim 34] Pfitzner taught the method of claim 27 wherein step (d) further comprises the access control server downloading the file from the content server (web server services retrieves file from second reference point, pgraph 52).

[claim 35] Pfitzner taught a system for providing file contents comprising:

a client node requesting a file having a native file type (requesting business object,

pgraph 34; XML file type, pgraph 27, lines 17-20);

an access control server receiving the request for the file and making an access control

decision to determine a level of access for the file (using redirection decision rules,

pgraph 39); and

an application server presenting the file contents to the client node using an application

program associated with a second file type for the requested file, wherein the second

file type is determined responsive to the level of access (displaying business object,

pgraph 52; using groupware application 420).

[claim 36] Pfitzner taught the system of claim 35 wherein the application server (in one

embodiment web server services including redirection server) further comprises

identifying the application program associated with the second file type (computing

environment information type of software, pgraph 38).

[claim 37] Pfitzner taught the system of claim 35 wherein the access control server

(redirection service) further comprises identifying the application program associated

with the second file type (computing environment information type of software, pgraph

38).

[claim 38] Pfitzner taught the system of claim 35 wherein the access control server

(redirection service) further comprises a database storing at least one policy (redirection

decision rule, pgraphs 37, 39).

[claim 45] Pfitzner taught the system of claim 35 wherein the application server includes a database containing at least one application program (plurality of methods) associated with at least one file type (pgraph 59).

[claim 46] Pfitzner taught the system of claim 45 wherein the application server further comprising determining an identifier for an application program by querying the database (pgraph 59).

[claim 47] Pfitzner taught the system of claim 35 wherein the access control server transmits an executable file to the client node (reference address to method, pgraph 62).

[claim 48] Pfitzner taught the system of claim 47 wherein the executable file includes an identifier for the application program associated with the second file type (pgraph 62).

[claim 49] Pfitzner taught the system of claim 47 wherein the executable file identifies an application server (pgraph 62).

[claim 50] Pfitzner taught the system of claim 47 wherein the client node makes a connection to the application server identified by the executable file (connection invoking the method, pgraphs 40, 62).

[claim 51] Pfitzner taught the system of claim 47 wherein the application server accepts a connection from the client node (connection invoking the method, pgraph 40).

[claim 52] Pfitzner taught the system of claim 47 wherein the client node transmits the identifier for the application program identified by the executable file to the application server (pgraphs 40, 62).

[claim 53] Pfitzner taught the system of the claim 47 wherein the application server

presents the file contents over the connection to the client node (pgraphs 40, 52).

[claim 54] Pfitzner taught the method of claim 1, the step of presenting the contents of

the file further comprises:

using the identifier for the application program to identify an application server

(connection invoking the method, pgraphs 40, 62);

connecting to the identified application server (pgraph 40); and

presenting the contents of the file to the client node in a format selected by the

application server (pgraph 39).

[claims 55, 56] Pfitzner taught the second file type is different from the native file type

(native file type is XML, pgraph 27, lines 17-20; second file type based on computing

environment, pgraph 56).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8.   Claims 14-16, 39-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Pfitzner in view of Hofmann et al., USPN 6,519,581 B1 (hereafter referred to as

Hofmann).

[claim 14] Pfitzner taught the method of claim 1 further comprising the step of

transmitting, by the access control server, a discovery request to the client node

(transmitting remote procedure call, pgraph 50). Pfitzner does not specifically teach the

discovery request is a discovery agent. However, Hofmann taught transmitting a

discovery agent (column 3, lines 50-56).

[claim 15] Pfitzner taught the method of claim 1 further comprising the step of acquiring,

by the access control server (redirection service), information about the client node

using a discovery request (acquiring computing environment information using remote

procedure call, pgraph 50). Pfitzner does not specifically teach the discovery request is

a discovery agent. However, Hofmann taught transmitting a collection agent (discovery

agent, column 3, lines 50-56).

[claim 16] Pfitzner taught the method of claim 15 wherein step (c) further comprises

comparing the information acquired by the discovery request to a policy to make the

access control decision (using redirection decision rules, pgraph 51). Pfitzner does not

specifically teach the discovery request is a collection agent. However, Hofmann taught

a collection agent (discovery agent, column 3, lines 50-56).

 [claim 39] Pfitzner taught the system of claim 35 wherein the access control server

(redirection service) further comprises a discovery code acquiring information about the

client node (acquiring computing environment information using remote procedure call,

pgraph 50). Pfitzner does not specifically teach a collection agent. However, Hofmann

taught a collection agent (discovery agent, column 3, lines 50-56).

[claim 40] Pfitzner the system of claim 39 wherein the access control server (redirection

service) further comprises making an access control decision based to determine the

level of access for the file based on the information acquired by the discovery request

(acquiring computing environment information, pgraph 50). Pfitzner does not specifically

teach the discovery request is a collection agent. However, Hofmann taught a discovery

request is a collection agent (column 3, lines 50-56).

[claim 41] Pfitzner taught the system of claim 39 wherein the access control server

further comprises making an access control decision to determine the level of access

for the file by applying a policy to the information acquired by the discovery request.

Pfitzner does not specifically teach the discovery request is a collection agent. However,

Hofmann taught the discovery request is a collection agent (column 3, lines 50-56).

[claim 42] Pfitzner taught the system of claim 39 wherein the discovery request acquires

information about the client node regarding device type (computing environment

information including type of computing device, pgraph 38). Pfitzner does not

specifically teach the discovery request is a collection agent. However, Hofmann taught the discovery request is a collection agent (column 3, lines 50-56).

[claim 43] Pfitzner taught the system of claim 39 wherein the discovery request acquires information about the client node (acquiring environment information using remote procedure call, pgraph 50) including network connection information (pgraph 7, lines 16-18). Pfitzner does not specifically teach the discovery agent is a collection agent. However, Hofmann taught a collection agent (column 3, lines 50-56).

[claim 44] Pfitzner taught the discovery request acquires information about the client node regarding authorization credentials (computing environment information including user identity, pgraph 54). Pfitzner does not specifically teach the discovery agent is a collection agent. However, Hofmann taught a discovery request is a collection agent (column 3, lines 50-56).

As to Hofmann, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that incorporating Hofmann's collection agent in Pfitzner's discovery system would have improved effectiveness. The motivation would have been to access computing environment information with less intervention.

9.   Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pfitzner in view of Numao et al., US 2001/0023421 A1 (hereafter referred to as Numao).

[claim 17] Pfitzner taught teach the method of claim 1 wherein step (c) further comprises processing, by the access control server (redirection service), the request (pgraph 54). Pfitzner does not specifically the processing is rejection. However, Numao taught rejecting, by the access control server, the request (pgraph 62). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that incorporating Numao's rejection decision in Pfitzner's decision rules would have improved robustness. The motivation would have been to provide a mechanism to address failure to access a business object.

10.   Claims 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pfitzner in view of Peacock, USPN 6,868,451 B1 (hereafter referred to as Peacock). [claim 18] Pfitzner taught the method of claim 1 wherein step (d) further comprises determining, by the access control server (redirection service), the second file type (extracting computing environment information, pgraph 38). Pfitzner does not specifically teach identifying second file type by a file extension of the second file extension. However, Peacock taught a file type is a file extension (column 4, lines 1-4). [claim 19] Pfitzner taught the method of claim 1 wherein step (e) further comprises determining, by an application server (web server service), the identifier of the application (using database to accessing correction application program, pgraph 67). Pfitzner does not specifically teach querying a database for the application program to use with a file extension. However, Peacock taught querying a database for the application program to use a file extension (column 12, lines 9-23).

As to Peacock, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that incorporating Peacock's database would have provided an equivalent mechanism for accessing an application program. The motivation would have been to include a mechanism for interpreting the type of software.

Conclusion

11.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Patrice Winder whose telephone number is 571-272-

3935. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 10:30 am-7:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached on 571-272-3933. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

                                                    /Patrice Winder/
                                                    Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2445

April 26, 2009